UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,817	08/31/2001	Gene Golovchinsky	FXPL-01001US0	2360

23910 7590 08/08/2006

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER	
RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,817	GOLOVCHINSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39 and 41-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39 and 41-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 22 May 2006, to the original application, filed 31 August 2001.

2. Claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, 26, 38-39, 42, 51, and 53 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729).

3. The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 10, 16-17, 41, and 52 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1).

5. Claims 18-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1), and Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

6. Claims 22-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1), Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1), and Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

7. Claim 21 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1), Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) and Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,651,058 B1).

8. Claims 13, 24, 43, and 54 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

9. Claim 25 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) and Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

10. Claims 27, 31-33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

11. Claims 28, 44, and 55 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1).

12. Claims 30, 34-35, 46-47, and 56 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1) and Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

13. Claims 1-39 and 41-56 are pending. Claim 40 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 39, and 51 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 22 May 2006 with respect to claims 1-11, 13-28, 29-39, and 41-56 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to independent claims 1, 39, and 51, and dependent claim 5, Applicant argues on Page 13 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach an annotation. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches the use of a substrate supporting areas that allow a user to provide an indication of his or her selection of a particular hyperlink (See Reber, Column 5, lines 38-49. Reber further teaches that the

user tags a portion of the substrate by making a "mark", such as by filling in a portion of the substrate using a pen of a pencil (See Reber, Column 5, lines 44-49). These marks indicate that the user has requested to browse a particular resource associated with the portion of the substrate where the user has made his or her mark onto the substrate (See Reber, Column 7, lines 4-17). The Instant Specification refers to annotations as freeform markings, or marks on or near hypertext link anchors (See Instant Specification, Page 5, paragraph 0004). The Office maintains that the freeform marking of a substrate by a user to indicate the selection of a hypertext link to which the user would like to navigate equates to the Applicant's detected marks on or near hypertext link anchors. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to equate the markings on the substrate indicating a hyperlink selection of Reber to the annotated anchor of the Instant Invention. The motivation for doing so, as stated in the Final Office Action filed 21 February 2006 and supported by the Reber disclosure, would have been to allow a user to select the resource on a document, such as a URL, by making a mark within a designated boundary in close proximity to the resource (See Reber, Column 9, lines 36-52).

With respect to dependent claim 3, Applicant argues on Page 14 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach an implicit anchor. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches an implicit link represented by a bar code to allow a user to navigate to a resource (See Reber, Column 4, lines 44-53).

With respect to dependent claim 11, Applicant argues on Page 15 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach that the format includes displaying the annotated

anchors according to annotated anchor metadata. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches textual information corresponding to the tagged resources (See Reber, Column 11, lines 62-67). The Instant Specification states that metadata may include information pertaining to the annotated anchor, such as the link it represents or any other desired organizational technique (See Instant Specification, Pages 16-17, paragraph 0063). The Office maintains that the textual information corresponding to the tagged resources of Reber provides information pertaining to the link represented by the annotation anchor and therefore equates to metadata used to display the annotated anchors.

With respect to dependent claims 14 and 42, Applicant argues on Page 16 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to target [meta]data. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches displaying the annotated anchors according to the textual information, such as the name of the link, corresponding to the annotated anchor (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

With respect to dependent claims 15 and 53, Applicant argues on Page 16 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach that the target is a second document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches that the target is another Web site, such as the Motorola website (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-17).

With respect to dependent claim 38, Applicant argues on Page 16 of the Instant Amendment that Reber fails to teach displaying the annotated anchor. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches displaying the annotated anchors according to

the textual information, such as the name of the link, corresponding to the annotated anchor (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

With respect to dependent claims 10, 41, and 52, Applicant argues on Page 17 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Wright fails to teach annotated an anchor. The Office respectfully disagrees and maintains that Reber teaches this limitation as discussed above.

With respect to dependent claims 22 and 23, Applicant argues on Page 18 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Wright, Carro and Ingram ails to teach representing a link to at least one target and where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target metadata. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram teaches representing a link to at least one target (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040). Wright further teaches that the format includes displaying an annotated anchor according to target metadata, such as annotation attributes (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 0010).

With respect to dependent claims 22 and 23, Applicant argues on Page 18 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Wright, Carro and Ingram fails to teach a data structure or format for displaying annotated anchors. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber teaches a storage device for storing annotated anchors (See Reber, Figure 3, element 150, and Column 8, lines 24-32).

With respect to dependent claim 13, Applicant argues on Page 19 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Carro fails to teach a number of marks associated with a target. The Office respectfully disagrees. Reber further teaches that

the user tags a portion of the substrate by making a "mark", such as by filling in a portion of the substrate using a pen of a pencil (See Reber, Column 5, lines 44-49). These marks indicate that the user has requested to browse a particular resource associated with the portion of the substrate where the user has made his or her mark onto the substrate (See Reber, Column 7, lines 4-17). In addition, Carro teaches a number of marks associated with a target, such as a mark indicating the selection of desired information or services (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055).

With respect to dependent claims 24, 43, and 54, Applicant argues on Page 19 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Carro fails to teach determining whether the second document is stored in the system and obtaining the second document if it is not already stored. The Office respectfully disagrees. Carro teaches determining if a document is stored in the system by determining if it exists in a hyperlink table (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080). Carro further teaches obtaining the document if it is not in the table (See Carro, Page 5, paragraph 0071).

With respect to dependent claim 25, Applicant argues on Page 19-20 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Carro and Ingram fails to teach including a reference to the first and second targets in the second document, and that a hyperlink or anchor is within the second document. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram teaches including a reference to targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041) and that a hyperlink or anchor is located within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

With respect to dependent claims 31-33 and 45, Applicant argues on Page 20 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Ingram fails to teach suppressing a display of a second anchor by taking a snapshot of the anchor, or hyperlink, and including the anchor or hyperlink reference on a taskbar. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram teaches suppressing the display of a hyperlink by referencing the hyperlink on a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039-0040).

With respect to dependent claims 36 and 48, Applicant argues on Page 21 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Ingram fails to teach identifying, in the hypertext structure, a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram teaches allowing the reader to see only the item, or hyperlink representation, listed in a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040).

With respect to dependent claim 37 and 49, Applicant argues on Page 21 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Ingram fails to teach that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, an object representing the link and suppressing a display of the object. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram teaches suppressing the display of a hyperlink by referencing the hyperlink on a taskbar and suppressing the display of the hyperlink object by minimizing the taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039-0040).

With respect to dependent claim 50, Applicant argues on Page 22 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Ingram fails to teach that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the

annotated anchor and the target. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0047). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of the anchor and the target of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the user an easy one click method for returning to the page of origin (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0050).

With respect to dependent claims 28, 44, and 55, Applicant argues on Page 22 of the Instant Amendment that Reber in combination with Bays fails to teach that annotations may be written to other data items. The Office respectfully disagrees. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Reber and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations of Bays to the annotated anchor representing a second target of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017).

Applicant's arguments, see Request for Continued Examination, filed 22 May 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 12 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, 26, 38-39, 42, 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729).

As per independent claims 1, 39, and 51, and dependent claim 5, Reber discloses a system and method for detecting an indication in a document or documents stored in a processor-readable storage medium (See Reber, Column 8, lines 24-32) including code for locating an indication in the document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 35-38), code for detecting, close to or within the indication, an anchor (See Reber, Column 9, lines 39-46), where the processor-readable storage medium communicates the first code and the second code to a processor to detect the indicated anchor in the document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 39-46) and to perform at least one process on the indicated anchor, such as storing a portion of the information (See Reber, Column 9, lines 53-55). While Reber does not disclose expressly an annotation to the document, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

conclude that the indication, or mark, of Reber is equivalent to the annotation of the Instant Invention. The motivation for such a conclusion would have been to allow the user of the Reber system to select the resources on a document, such as URLs, by making a mark within a designated boundary in close proximity to the resource (See Reber, Column 9, lines 36-52).

As per dependent claim 2, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses that the detecting code detects an anchor that represents an explicit link to at least one other location (See Reber, Column 4, lines 25-27).

As per dependent claim 3, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses that the detecting code detects an anchor that represents an implicit link to at least one other location (See Reber, Column 4, lines 44-53).

As per dependent claim 4, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses a data structure referencing the annotated anchor (See Reber, Column 8, lines 24-27).

As per dependent claim 6, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the processing code includes generating a data structure including the annotated anchor (See Reber, Column 9, lines 64-67, and Column 10, lines 1-8).

As per dependent claim 7, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Reber also discloses that the data structure includes a number of annotated anchors (See Reber, Column 10, lines 19-32).

As per dependent claim 8, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Reber also discloses that the number of annotated anchors are obtained from at least one document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 35-38).

As per dependent claim 9, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Reber also discloses that the number of annotated anchors in the data structure are displayed in a format (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per dependent claim 11, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Reber also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to annotated anchor metadata (See Reber, Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per dependent claims 14 and 42, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 9 and 39 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22), where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to target data (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per dependent claims 15 and 53, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 14 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the target is a second document (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-17).

As per dependent claim 26, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least a second document (See Reber, Column 4, lines 15-22, and Figure 2), where the processing code includes obtaining the second document (See Reber, Column 12, lines 18-23).

As per dependent claim 38, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22), where the processing code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-23).

16. Claims 10, 16-17, 41, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 9, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1).

As per dependent claims 10, 41, and 52, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 9, 39, and 51 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly displaying the annotated anchors according to annotation metadata. Wright discloses displaying anchors according to metadata or attributes, such as color, size or shape. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 10). Reber and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the formatted display of Wright with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 41, and 52.

As per dependent claims 16 and 17, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly adding the annotated anchor to a data structure based on at least one attribute value. Wright discloses code which includes adding anchors or hyperlinks to a data structure based on at least one attribute, and that the data structure has a number of hyperlinks that have at least one attribute value. (See Wright, Abstract). Reber and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

17. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1), as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

As per dependent claims 18-20, Reber and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Reber and Wright do not disclose expressly that the annotated anchors have at least one attribute value. Carro discloses including the position of the marked or annotated item (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Wright also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors or hyperlinks according to the annotation metadata or attributes. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 0010). Reber, Wright and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the position attribute of Carro with the system and method of Reber and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify the information and/or service associated with the position of the selected marked item (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the system and method of Reber and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to combine Wright and Carro with Reber and Wright for the benefit of identifying the information and/or service associated with the position of the selected marked item and allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 18-20.

18. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1), as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per dependent claims 22-23, Reber, Wright and Carro disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchors, which have at least one attribute value each, represent a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber, Wright and Carro do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors that have at least one attribute value according to target metadata. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchors of Reber, Carro and Wright as described above each represent a link to at least one target and where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target metadata. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040). Reber, Carro, Wright and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

include the displaying of annotated anchors according to target metadata of Ingram with the system and method of Reber, Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to activate the hyperlink at any time (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber, Carro and Wright for the benefit of enabling users to activate the hyperlink at any time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

19. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,651,058 B1).

As per dependent claim 21, Reber, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Reber, Carro and Wright do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors, which have at least one attribute value according to annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format. Reber, Carro, Wright and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art to include the metadata association of Sundaresan with the system and method of Reber, Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Reber, Carro and Wright for the benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

20. Claims 13, 24, 43, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

As per dependent claim 13, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly a number of annotated anchors representing a target. Carro discloses a number of marks associated with a target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Reber and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the number of marks associated with a target of Carro with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to indicate the position of multiple links within a hyperlink table by

selecting marks located within a defined boundary (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Carro with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to indicate the position of multiple links within a hyperlink table by selecting marks located within a defined boundary to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13,

As per dependent claims 24, 43 and 54, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that at least one of the annotated anchors represent a link to a second document (See Reber, Column 4, lines 15-22, and Figure 2). Reber does not disclose expressly determining whether the second document is stored in the system. Carro discloses determining whether the second document is stored in the system (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080) and obtaining the second document if it is not already stored (See Carro, Page 5, paragraph 0071). Reber and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the determination as to whether the second document is stored in the system of Carro with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to access an existing document as referenced within the hyperlink table (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080-0081). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Carro with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to access an existing document as referenced within the hyperlink table to obtain the invention as specified in claims 24, 43 and 54.

21. Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per dependent claims 12 and 25, Reber and Carro disclose the limitations of claim 24 as described above. Reber also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target (See Reber, Column 10, liens 19-32). Reber and Carro do not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber, Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber and Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Ingram with Reber and Carro for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

22. Claims 27, 31-33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 26, 5, and 39 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per dependent claim 27, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly obtaining the second document prior to a reader requesting the second document. Ingram discloses obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents and enabling access to the documents by adding items representing the documents to a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time (See Ingram, Pages 2-3, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of enabling users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

As per dependent claims 31 and 45, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly suppressing a display of the second anchor. Ingram discloses suppressing a display of a second anchor by taking a snapshot of the anchor, or hyperlink, and including the anchor or hyperlink reference on a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of the second anchor of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 31 and 45.

As per dependent claim 32, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Reber also discloses that the second anchor is within the document (See Reber, Figure 1, elements 32 and 34, and Column 5,lines 50-54).

As per dependent claim 33, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Reber also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly locating at least a second document

that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

As per dependent claims 36 and 48, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly identifying a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node. Ingram discloses identifying, in the hypertext structure, a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of a node of

Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 36 and 48.

As per dependent claims 37 and 49, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 48 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, an object representing the link and suppressing a display of the object. (See Ingram, Page 4, paragraph 0054). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of an object of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 37 and 49.

As per dependent claim 50, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 39 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly displaying simultaneously the annotated anchor and the target. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0047). Reber and

Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of the anchor and the target of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the user an easy one click method for returning to the page of origin (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0050). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of providing the user with an easy one click method for returning the page of origin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

23. Claims 28, 44, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1).

As per dependent claims 28, 44, and 55, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target and that the code includes detecting a second anchor representing a link to the target. (See Reber, Column 4,lines 14-22, and Figure 2). Reber does not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the second anchor. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Reber and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays with the annotated anchor representing a second target of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays with Reber for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28, 44 and 55.

24. Claims 29-30, 34-35, 46-47, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1) as applied to claims 28 and 46 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per dependent claims 29-30, Reber and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Reber and Bays do not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber, Bays, and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber and Bays. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber and Bays for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claims 29-30.

As per dependent claims 34, 46, and 56, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the node. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes identifying, in a hypertext structure, a node representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Reber, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays and the annotated anchor representing a second target of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays and Ingram

with Reber for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 34, 46 and 56.

As per dependent claim 35 and 47, Reber, Ingram, and Bays disclose the limitations of claims 34 and 46 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, a connecting object representing the link, such as a graphic element, and altering the connecting object, such as reducing it's size. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Reber, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification, in the hypertext structure, of a connecting object representing the link, and alteration of the connecting object, such as a reduction in size, of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber, Ingram and Bays for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 35 and 47.

Conclusion

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER